

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
 AMARILLO DIVISION

WILLIE G. WALKER, PRO SE,	§	
also known as	§	
WILLIE GEORGE WALKER,	§	
TDCJ-CID No. 1245920,	§	
Previous TDCJ-CID No. 420030,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	2:09-CV-0243
	§	
WILLIAM BRADSHAW ET AL.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff WILLIE G. WALKER, acting pro se and while a prisoner incarcerated in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, has filed suit pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, section 1983, complaining against the above-referenced defendants and has been granted permission to proceed in forma pauperis

**JUDICIAL REVIEW**

When a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity, the Court must evaluate the complaint and dismiss it without service of process, *Ali v. Higgs*, 892 F.2d 438, 440 (5th Cir. 1990), if it is frivolous<sup>1</sup>, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. 1915A; 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2). The same standards will

---

<sup>1</sup>A claim is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or in fact, *Booker v. Koonce*, 2 F.3d 114, 115 (5th Cir. 1993); *see, Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 1733, 118 L.Ed.2d 340 (1992).

support dismissal of a suit brought under any federal law by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, where such suit concerns prison conditions. 42 U.S.C. 1997e(c)(1). A *Spears* hearing need not be conducted for every *pro se* complaint. *Wilson v. Barrientos*, 926 F.2d 480, 483 n.4 (5th Cir. 1991)<sup>2</sup>.

The Magistrate Judge has reviewed plaintiff's pleadings and has viewed the facts alleged by plaintiff to determine if his claims present grounds for dismissal or should proceed to answer by defendants.

### THE LAW AND ANALYSIS

Upon receipt of plaintiff's September 29, 2009 original complaint, naming only BRADSHAW as a defendant, the Court issued an Order to Amend Complaint, providing plaintiff with a complaint form and ordering plaintiff to amend his complaint and state what defendant BRADSHAW did or failed to do that plaintiff felt constituted a violation of his constitutional rights. By his October 15, 2009 Amended Complaint, plaintiff added two defendants, Dr. LENZ and Head Warden WHEELER, but did not state what they or defendant BRADSHAW did, nor has he stated in any intelligible way the relief he wants the Court to award to him, stating only that he wants the court "to work his case out give a lot action help me it was not anything I could do was to take what even they put out I had to go by it [sic et passim]."

In the Order to Amend Complaint, plaintiff was informed his cause could be dismissed

---

<sup>2</sup>Cf. *Green v. McKaskle*, 788 F.2d 1116, 1120 (5th Cir. 1986) ("Of course, our discussion of *Spears* should not be interpreted to mean that all or even most prisoner claims require or deserve a *Spears* hearing. A district court should be able to dismiss as frivolous a significant number of prisoner suits on the complaint alone or the complaint together with the *Watson* questionnaire.").

for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff's present amended complaint does not set forth what each defendant did or failed to do which caused plaintiff to sue him or her.

To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, "the plaintiff must plead 'enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litigation*, 495 F.3d 191, 205 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007)(quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 174 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007)). A plausible entitlement to relief exists when the allegations in the complaint cross the thresholds separating the "conclusory" from the "factual" and the "factually neutral" from the "factually suggestive." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 n.5, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 174 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007).

While plaintiff is apparently dissatisfied with something that happened during a shakedown and either his medical care or his housing assignment during medical care, plaintiff has not clearly articulated what his claims are or presented a factual allegation of any sort to support his suit against any one, much less all, of the defendants. Plaintiff has been given the opportunity to amend his complaint; however, when informed of the defects in his original complaint, plaintiff submitted an amended complaint which merely multiplied these defects and cured none of them.

### **CONCLUSION**

Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, sections 1915A and 1915(e)(2), as well as Title 42, United States Code, section 1997e(c)(1), it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge to the United States District Judge that the Civil Rights Complaint filed pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, section 1983, and and Title 42, United States Code, section 121343 by

plaintiff WILLIE G. WALKER be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM ON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED THIS 14th DAY OF JUNE 2010.

  
CLINTON E. AVERITTE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**\* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT \***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event parties wish to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is fourteen (14) days from the date of filing as indicated by the “entered” date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(E). **Any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed** as indicated by the “entered” date. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled “Objections to the Report and Recommendation.” Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party’s failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation contained in this report shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge in this report and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).